UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,474	07/11/2001	Norman Wesley Gimbert	13DV-14215	9339

7590   08/22/2007

John S. Beulick
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
One metropolitan Sq., Suite 2600
St. Louis, MO 63102

EXAMINER
ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 May 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11, 13-14, and 16-18* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11, 13-14, and 16-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)　　　　　　　　　Office Action Summary　　　　　　　　Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20070712

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 31-May-

2007 has been entered.

2.   The amendment filed on 12-April -2007 has been received and entered. Claim 12

has been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-11, 13-14, and 16-18 are now pending.

3.   Applicant's listings of the claims filed on 4/12/2007 contradict the statement

made in the remarks on page 8, lines 2-3, filed on 4/12/2007 and contradicts the

statement made on page 15, second paragraph since claim 15 is missing all together. The

Examiner is following the claim listings. Accordingly, claims 1-11, 13-14, and 16-18 are

now pending.

4.   Applicant's amendment has overcome the previous claim objections and

rejections under 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

The newly amended recitation of claim 13 teaches "receive information from the

user browser, where rein the information related to navigation structure changes":

without any prior disclosure to a "user browser" and without any indication as to whom is

doing the receiving, where is the receiving is taking place and what information is being

received? Is it the navigational changes or the user input or just general information

indicating the changes have occurred?

7.   Claims 1, 6, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between

the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: Specification paragraph

0018 teaches, "Each business entity hosts approximately half of the navigational pages that are

accessible through system 7. Each navigational page includes links to data stored on each entities

respective servers. The pages are coordinated such that the navigational structure is substantially identical

for each business entity's users" and paragraph 30, both clearly indicate the WebPages and

links are what changes and they maintained together with various information in a

historical log all of which appears to be missing in the claims.

7.   "Substantially identical" is being interpreted to be "similar and not exactly the

same" since there's no definition to ascertain otherwise in the specification.

"Substantially" appears to be a term of degree and not quantitative. It's unclear if it's

meant to read on the same content or same number of links or the same access point.

Therefor, the examiner is broadly interpreting the recitation to be "a site map".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hobbs (U.S. Patent No. 6,523,022 B1) in view of DaCosta et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,826,553 B1), and further in view of Blinn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,158,997 B2).

        As to claim 6, Hobbs discloses a system of communicating information to a user

via a computer including a browser, said system comprising:

        a first server system controlled and operated by a first business entity comprising

a first web server and a first database including data owned by the first business entity,

said first web server coupled to said first database and to said network, said first web

server displays a first web site populated with data from said first database at the user

computer such that the fist web site has a navigational structure (See Hobbs Figure 12,

and see Hobbs Figure 13, Site Plan); and

        a second server system controlled and operated by a second business entity

comprising a second web server and a second database including data owned by the

second business entity, said second web server coupled to said second database and to

said network, said second web server displays at user computer a second web site

populated with data from said second database, said first web site and said second web

site synchronized to function together as a collaborative web site wherein at least a

portion of the data included in the collaborative website is hosted from the first website

by the first business entity and at least a portion of the data included in the collaborative

website is hosted from the second website by the second business entity wherein the

collaborative web site is hosted jointly by the first and second business entity, and the

data stored in said first server system database is accessible to a user browser via said

second server system, and the data stored in said second server system database is

accessible to the user browser via said first server system, and the collaborative website is

displayed to the user enabling the user to access data stored in at least one of said first

and second server system.

Hobbs does not teach at least one of said first database and said second database

maintains a record of navigational structure changes in a spreadsheet format.

DaCosta et al. teaches at least one of said first database and said second database

maintains a record of navigation changes in a spreadsheet format (See DaCosta et al.

column 5, lines 13-25, also see DaCosta et al. column 6, lines 42-47, and see DaCosta et

al. column 12, lines 1-4, and DaCosta et al. column 17, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Hobbs by the teaching of DaCosta et al. to include

recording changes in the structure of at least one of the first and second web sites in a

spreadsheet format because it is well known in the art to utilize various applications

including spreadsheets to store website log data.

Hobbs as modified still does not explicitly teach such that the second web site has

a navigational structure substantially identical to the first web site navigation structure.

Hobbs teaches site plan and site index which are navigational structures of a website in

Figures 12 and 13.

Blinn et al. teaches such that the second web site has a navigational structure

substantially identical to the first web site navigation structure (See Blinn et al. column 3,

lines 14-22, and see Blinn et al. column 5, lines 4-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Blinn

et al. to include such that the second web site has a navigational structure substantially

identical to the first web site navigation structure because it makes it easier to identify

and combine similar structures thus keeping better management and control of websites.

As to claim 7, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein said data stored in said first

server system and said second server system accessible to the user browser based on

individual access privileges (See Hobbs column 10, lines 25-27).

10.   Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-14, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hobbs (U.S. Patent No. 6,523,022 B1) in view of DaCosta et al. (U.S.

Patent No. 6,826,553 B1), and further in view of Garrow et al. (U.S. Pub. No.

2002/0194160 A1), and further in view of Blinn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,158,997 B2).

As to claim 1, Hobbs discloses a method for communicating information between

business entities in a collaborative development using a system including a first server

system controlled and operated by a first business entity and a second server system

operated by a second business entity, the first server system including a first web server

hosting a website of the first business entity and a first database including data owned by

the first business entity, the second server system including a second web server hosting a

website of the second business entity and a second database including data owned by the

second business entity, said method comprising the steps of:

coupling the first web server to the first database controlled by the first business

entity, wherein the first web server populates a first web site with data from the first

database such that the first web site has a navigational structure (See Hobbs Figure 12,

and see Hobbs Figure 13, Site Plan), the data including information that the first business

entity wants to share with the second business entity (See Hobbs column 14, lines 50-65,

wherein "first server system" deemed to include the original Web site of the business –

i.e. "E&Y, Lexis/Nexis");

coupling the second web server to the second database controlled by the second

business entity, wherein the second web server populates a second web site with data

from the second database, the data including information that the second business entity

wants to share with the first business entity (See Hobbs column 25, lines 29-35, and

Hobbs column 28, lines 44-60, also see Hobbs column 14, lines 50-65, wherein "second

server system" deemed to include the "warehouse system");

synchronizing the first web site and the second web site to function together as a

collaborative web site wherein at least a portion of the data included in the collaborative

website is hosted from the first website by the first business entity and at least a portion

of the data included in the collaborative website is hosted from the second website by the

second business entity wherein the collaborative web site is hosted jointly by the first and

second business entity (See Hobbs column 3, lines 50-52, prior art., also see Hobbs

column 7, lines 19-29, and see Hobbs column 10, lines 13-27); and

accessing the first web site and the data stored in the first server system database

by a user associated with the second business entity via the collaborative website (See

Hobbs column 25, lines 11-20);

accessing the second web site and the data stored in the second server system

database by a user associated with the first business entity to select a link displayed on

the collaborative website (See Hobbs column 25, lines 11-20, also see Hobbs Figure 6).

Hobbs does not teach recording changes in the structure of at least one of the first

and second web sites in a spreadsheet format.

DaCosta et al. teaches recording changes in the structure of at least one of the first

and second web sites in a spreadsheet format (See DaCosta et al. column 5, lines 13-25,

also see DaCosta et al. column 6, lines 42-47, and see DaCosta et al. column 12, lines 1-

4, and DaCosta et al. column 17, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Hobbs by the teaching of DaCosta et al. to include

recording changes in the structure of at least one of the first and second web sites in a

spreadsheet format because it is well known in the art to utilize various applications

including spreadsheets to store website log data.

Hobbs as modified still does not teach aircraft and aircraft engine information.

Garrow et al. teaches aircraft and aircraft engine information (See Garrow et al.

page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et

al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of

Garrow et al. to include aircraft and aircraft engine information because providing

specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of

information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

Hobbs as modified still does not explicitly teach such that the second web site has

a navigational structure substantially identical to the first web site navigation structure.

Hobbs teaches site plan and site index which are navigational structures of a website in

Figures 12 and 13.

Blinn et al. teaches such that the second web site has a navigational structure

substantially identical to the first web site navigation structure (See Blinn et al. column 3,

lines 14-22, and see Blinn et al. column 5, lines 4-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Blinn

et al. to include such that the second web site has a navigational structure substantially

identical to the first web site navigation structure because it makes it easier to identify

and combine similar structures thus keeping better management and control of websites.

As to claim 2, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein said step of coupling the first

web server to the first database further comprises the step of providing a first server

system (See Hobbs column 11, lines 63-67, also see Hobbs column 14, lines 45-59)

hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer (See Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058, also

see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-

0071).

As to claim 3, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein said step of coupling the

second web server to the second database further comprises the step of providing a

second server system hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer (See Garrow et al. page

6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al.

page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

As to claim 4, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein said step of accessing the first

web site and the data stored in the first server system further comprises the step of

accessing data from the first and second server systems based on individual access

privileges (See Hobbs column 11, lines 63-67, also see Hobbs column 14, lines 45-59).

As to claim 5, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein said step of accessing data

stored in the first server system further comprises the step of selectively accessing (See

Hobbs column 11, lines 63-67, also see Hobbs column 14, lines 45-59) at least one of

aircraft engine and aircraft data relating to at least one of general information data, plans

and schedules data, propulsion systems data, and engineering data (See Garrow et al.

column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

As to claim 8, Hobbs as modified discloses said first server system, said second

server system hosted by a business partner (See Hobbs column 35, lines 27-35, wherein

"partner" reads on "sponsor").

Hobbs as modified still does not teach hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer.

Garrow et al. teaches hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer (See Garrow et al.

page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of

Garrow et al. to include hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer because providing

specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of

information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

As to claims 9, and 10, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein at least one of said

first database and said second (See Hobbs column 25, lines 12-17).

Hobbs as modified still does not teach database includes aircraft engine data

relating to at least one of general information data, propulsion systems data, and

engineering.

Garrow et al. teaches database includes aircraft engine data relating to at least one

of general information data, propulsion systems data, and engineering (See Garrow et al.

column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of

Garrow et al. to include hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer; hosted by a business

partner of the aircraft engine manufacturer; and at least one of plans and schedules,

propulsion systems, and engineering because providing specific records dealing with one

industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of information thereby reducing

business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

As to claim 13, Hobbs discloses a web-based communications system comprising:

a computer comprising a browser; a network coupled to said computer (See

Hobbs Figure 4, shows a networked computer with a browser);

a first server system controlled and operated (by a business) comprising a first

web server and a first database, said first web server coupled to said first database and to

said network, said first web server configured to display at said computer a first web site

having navigation al structure (See Hobbs Figure 12, and see Hobbs Figure 13, Site Plan)

and populated with data from said first database (See Hobbs column 14, lines 50-65,

wherein "first server system" deemed to include the original Web site of the business –

i.e. "E&Y, Lexis/Nexis"); and

a second server system controlled and operated (by a second business) comprising

a second web server and a second database, said second web server coupled to said

second database and to said network, said second web server configured to display at said

computer a second web site populated with data from said second database (See Hobbs

column 14, lines 50-65, wherein "second server system" deemed to include the

"warehouse system");

wherein said system is configured to:

.   synchronize said first web site and said second web site such that said first web

site and said second web site function together as a collaborative web site wherein at least

a portion of the data included in the collaborative website is hosted from said first

website and at least a portion of said data included in said collaborative website is hosted

from said second website, and wherein said collaborative web site is hosted jointly by the

first and second business entity, and the data stored in said first server system database is

accessible to a user browser via said second server system, and the data stored in said

second server system database is accessible to said user browser via said first server

system and the collaborative website displayed to the user for accessing data stored in at

least one of said first and second server system (See Hobbs column 3, lines 50-52, prior

art., also see Hobbs column 7, lines 19-29, also see Hobbs column 9, lines 8-25, wherein

"first system" and "second system" reads on "first network source" and "second network

source", and see Hobbs column 10, lines 20-27, wherein "enabling" is interpreted as

intended use).

Hobbs does not teach at least one of said first database and said second database

maintains a record of navigation changes in a spreadsheet format.

DaCosta et al. teaches at least one of said first database and said second database

maintains a record of navigation changes entered by a user in a spreadsheet format (See

DaCosta et al. column 5, lines 13-25, also see DaCosta et al. column 6, lines 42-47, and

see DaCosta et al. column 12, lines 1-4, and DaCosta et al. column 17, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hobbs by the teaching of DaCosta et al. to include recording changes in the structure of at least one of the first and second web sites in a spreadsheet format because it is well known in the art to utilize various applications including spreadsheets to store website log data.

Hobbs as modified still does not teach the business being an aircraft engine manufacturer and second business being a partner of the aircraft manufacturer.

Garrow et al. teaches the business being an aircraft engine manufacturer and second business being a partner of the aircraft manufacturer (See Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Garrow et al. to include hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer or a partner of the aircraft manufacturer because providing specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

Hobbs as modified still does not explicitly teach such that the second web site has a navigational structure substantially identical to the first web site navigation structure. Hobbs teaches site plan and site index which are navigational structures of a website in Figures 12 and 13.

Blinn et al. teaches such that the second web site has a navigational structure

substantially identical to the first web site navigation structure (See Blinn et al. column 3,

lines 14-22, and see Blinn et al. column 5, lines 4-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Blinn

et al. to include such that the second web site has a navigational structure substantially

identical to the first web site navigation structure because it makes it easier to identify

and combine similar structures thus keeping better management and control of websites.

As to claim 14, Hobbs as modified discloses said first server system hosted by a

turbine engine manufacturer, said second server system hosted by an aircraft

manufacturer (See Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. column 9,

lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071, wherein "turbine

engine" reads on "jet engine").

As to claims 16, and 18, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein said browser

configured to display aircraft engine data relating to at least one of general information

data, plans and schedules data, propulsion systems data, and engineering data (See

Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-

0071).

11.   Claims 11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hobbs (U.S. Patent 6,523,022 B1) in view of DaCosta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,826,553

B1), further in view of Garrow et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0194160 A1), and further in

view of Blinn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,158,997 B2) as applied to claims 2-3, 5-10, 12, 14-

16, and 18 above, and still further in view of Glass et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,278,965).

As to claim 11 Hobbs as modified teaches said first database and said second

database (See Hobbs column 2, lines 47-51).

Hobbs as modified still does not teach wherein at least one of said database

maintains a record of navigation changes.

Glass et al. teaches wherein at least one of said first database and said second

database maintains a record of navigation changes (See Glass et al. column 5, lines 34-

51, wherein "maintains a record" reads on "flight history", also see Glass et al. column

22, lines 38-63, wherein "navigational changes" reads on "flight plans").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Glass

et al. to include wherein at least one of said first database and said second database

maintains a record of navigation changes because the partnership will reduce business

costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

As to claim 17, Hobbs as modified still does not teach wherein said browser

configured to selectively display an historical log relating to navigational changes to said

user interface.

Glass et al. teaches wherein said browser configured to selectively display an

historical log (See Glass et al. column 5, lines 41-48) relating to navigational changes

(See Glass et al. column 5, lines 34-51, wherein "maintains a record" reads on "flight history", also see Glass et al. column 22, lines 38-63, wherein "navigational changes" reads on "flight plans") to said user interface (See Glass et al. column 11, lines 12-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Glass et al. to include wherein said browser configured to selectively display an historical log relating to navigational changes to said user interface because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

Response to Arguments

12.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11, 13-14, and 16-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Motivation to combine does not have to be taught in the cited art to be valid under 35 USC 103 rejection as clearly supported by KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S.--, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include

knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper.

See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Conclusion

13.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Fields et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,655) teaches formatting and reuse of Web based content.

Rodgers et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0026478 A1) teaches forming linked users groups of shared software applications.

Inoue (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0038367 A1) teaches main site server and partner site server.

Call (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,441 B1) teaches using universal product codes for disseminating information over the Internet.

Vittal et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,907,401 B1) teaches portal switch for collective commerce.

Blinn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,158,997 B2) teaches unified provider application model for manufacturers product specification.

Kuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,225,225 B2) teaches selective synchronization of web browsers.

14.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 571-272-

4074. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5: 30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jeffrey A. Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Neveen Abel-Jalil
Primary Examiner
August 20, 2007